

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the clearly stated action. This is in response to the Office Action dated December 12, 2008. Claims 1-5 and 7-13 are pending. Claims 1, 4, and 5 have been amended, no claims are newly canceled, claim 6 remains canceled, and no claims have been added. No new matter has been introduced. The Director is authorized to charge any additional fees due by way of this Amendment only, or credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 19-1090. Reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested. With this amendment, claims 1-5, 7-13 are pending in the application.

I. Acknowledgement of Allowed Claims and Allowable Subject Matter

Acknowledgement is made of the Examiner's allowance of claims 4, 5, and 7-9, as noted on Page 4 of the Office Action. Acknowledgement is further made of the Examiner's indication that the subject matter of claims 12-13 is allowable, as noted on Page 4 of the Office Action. However, the parent claim from which claims 12-13 depend has not been amended in this response because it is believed, for the reasons detailed below, that independent claim 1 is allowable over the cited reference.

II. Amendment to Correct Minor Errors

Claim 1 has been amended in form. The claim scope has not been changed, but the claim is now presented such that the recitation of the bus station arranged in the first mode has been isolated from recitation of the bus station arranged in the second mode. Additionally, minor grammatical errors have been corrected.

Claim 4 has been amended in form. It is affirmed that "the bus station" is arranged to operate according to claim 4. Also, second and third recitations of "comprising" have been removed. Claim 4 remains in condition for allowance.

Claim 5 has been amended in form. A second recitation of "comprising" has been edited. A minor typographical error has also been corrected. Claim 5 remains in condition for allowance.

III. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

At Page 2 of the Office Action claims 1-3, 10-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by *Overtoom et al.*, (U.S. Pat. 6,732,218), hereinafter *Overtoom*. It is well established at law that for a proper rejection of a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102, the cited reference must disclose all elements/features/steps of the claim at issue. See, e.g., *E.I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. v. Phillips Petroleum Co.*, 849 F.2d 1430, 7 USPQ2d 1129 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Respectful disagreement is drawn with the rejections because it is not believed that *Overtoom* teaches each of the claimed features. Instead, in light of the remarks below, the rejections are traversed, all claims are now in condition for allowance, and respectful withdrawal of the rejections is requested.

Independent claim 1, as amended, recites, *inter alia*, “A bus station comprising: a first communication port and a second communication port, said bus station being arranged in ... said first mode of operation to pass communication between said host station coupled to said second port and a first device station coupled to said first port ... said bus station further being arranged to operate as an alternate host station in a second mode of operation, to communicate with said first device station coupled to said first port on behalf of a further device station coupled to said second port.” That is, the bus station of claim 1 requires only two ports, and in the second mode of operation, the bus station is arranged to communicate with the first device on the first port on behalf of the further device on the second port.

As shown in *Overtoom's* Fig. 3, two dedicated types of ports exist – a “B-PORT” 204 and a plurality of A-PORTS 202. An A-PORT and the B-PORT are identified in the Office Action, but those ports cannot operate according to the features of claim 1. In particular, *Overtoom's* B-PORT 204 cannot be the second communication port of claim 1.

As shown in *Overtoom's* Fig. 6, a PC having a “host” controller may be coupled with the B-PORT, and each of the A-PORTS are then assigned as downstream devices. Col. 5, Lines 23-31. On the other hand, there is no disclosure, teaching, or suggestion that *Overtoom's* hub 102 would permit a “device” to be coupled to the B-PORT. Instead, traditional USB devices or USB On-theGo (OTG) devices are only permitted to be connected to *Overtoom's* A-PORTS. Accordingly, the first and second communication ports of claim 1, both of which recite a

connected “device,” cannot be read on *Overtoom*’s A-PORT and B-PORT, and the current rejection of claim 1 is traversed.

Amended claim 1 is further allowable over a reading of *Overtoom* wherein the first and second communication ports of claim 1 are equated to two of *Overtoom*’s A-PORTS. As illustrated in Fig. 5, and described at Col. 4, Lines 11-45, a device may be connected to an A-PORT and then take over control as a host. In such embodiment, the OTG host device would obtain host control and “be directly connected to the remainder A-PORTS.”

On the other hand, when *Overtoom* permits connection of a traditional or OTG “first device” to a first A-PORT and a traditional or OTG “further device” to a second A-PORT, there is no provision for the hub to communicate with the first device “on behalf” of the further device. *Overtoom*’s hub has a host controller 208 (Fig. 5), but there is no disclosure, teaching, or suggestion that the host controller 208 can communicate with one device on behalf of another. Instead, *Overtoom* teaches that his host controller 208 is only used in two specific situations. First, *Overtoom*’s host controller will to address (enumerate) devices connected to A-PORTS when none of the devices desire to be host, and second, in cases where the microcontroller 206 in the hub 102 will act to determine which (if any) devices connected to A-PORTS are capable of using a “host negotiation protocol.” After the detection steps, *Overtoom*’s hub will only wait for an external device to request host control. See Col. 3, Line 40 – Col. 4, Line 10. Accordingly, *Overtoom* clearly does not disclose, teach, or suggest a bus station 102 capable of being arranged to operate as an alternate host station in the second mode of operation, and claim 1 is further allowable over the cited *Overtoom* reference.

IV. Conclusion

This amendment is made in order to reach agreement on the present claims and have the case advanced to allowance. The *Overtoom* reference does not disclose, teach, or suggest what is recited in the independent claims. Thus, given the above remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the presently rejected independent claim is in condition for allowance. The dependent claims that depend directly or indirectly on these independent claims

are likewise allowable based on at least the same reasons and based on the recitations contained in each dependent claim.

If a teaching in the cited reference that is relevant to the allowability of the claims has been overlooked, the Examiner is requested to specifically point out where such teaching may be found. Further, if there are any informalities or questions that can be addressed via telephone, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Mr. Satagaj at (206) 622-4900.

Respectfully submitted,
SEED Intellectual Property Law Group PLLC

/Thomas J. Satagaj/
Thomas J. Satagaj
Registration No. 62,391

TJS:jrh

701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 5400
Seattle, Washington 98104
Phone: (206) 622-4900
Fax: (206) 682-6031

1380228_1.DOC